

AR 45479

May 6, 2021


Mr. Aaron Roth
Committee Clerk
Committee Operations, Legislative Branch
3rd Floor, Federal Building
9820 -107 Street NW
Edmonton AB T5K 1E7

Dear Mr. Roth:

Attached are the written responses to outstanding questions from the April 6, 2021 Standing Committee on Public Accounts' review. This pertains to Justice and Solicitor General's outstanding Auditor General recommendations and the ministry's 2019/20 Annual Report.

If you have any questions about the attached items, please contact Brad Wells, Senior Financial Officer, at brad.wells@gov.ab.ca or at 780-415-1946.

Yours truly,



Frank Bosscha, QC
Deputy Minister of Justice
and Deputy Solicitor General

Attachments

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

1. Question (PA-417):

Ms. Renaud: ... My question is very straightforward. What can these municipalities, these communities that will be paying more for policing expect in terms of the number of Full Time Equivalent (FTEs)? I certainly understand that if you don't have those numbers here today, you could table those for the committee to look at a future date.

Mr. Cooley: Thank you for that. We have the provincial breakdown of the additional regular members and civilian members. We don't have it by municipality, but we can get back to you on that. As of February 2021 there were 76 regular member positions that were committed; 66 of those regular member positions have been filled. There were 57 public service employee or civilian positions, and 28 of those positions have been filled.

Answer:

As per the 2020/21 Provincial Police Service Agreement (PPSA) Call-Up of new positions, including 76 regular member and 57 public service employee positions, the Alberta RCMP has allotted positions in frontline policing, and specialized policing supports, including call back units, operational support unit, child advocacy centres, offender management, major crimes units, and crime reduction, while civilian positions have been created in areas, such as court case management, criminal operations, crime reduction and crime prevention.

Specifically, below is the 2020/21 allocation for the new regular member resources:

- 46 positions in rural Alberta Detachments
- 10 positions in the Call Back Unit
- 2 positions to KMOSS (member operational support)
- 3 positions to Child Advocacy Centers
- 3 positions to Emergency Response Teams
- 4 positions to Offender Management
- 3 positions to General Investigative Services
- 2 positions to Police Dog Services
- 3 positions to the Diversity Unit

The following public service employee positions have been allocated:

- 31 Detachment Services Support positions
- 1 Court Case Management position
- 2 Criminal Operations Strategic Management Services positions
- 4 Community Engagement and Outreach Specialists
- 4 Scenes of Crime Officers
- 6 Operational Call Center Operators
- 2 Operational Call Center Administrative Support positions
- 4 Rural Crime Reduction Analysts

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

- 1 Rural Crime Administrative Support positions
- 1 Forensic Identification Services Clerk
- Intellex position

Allocation for the 2021/22 new positions is still being determined.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

2. Question (PA-418):

Ms. Renaud: My question is: does your ministry not engage in any activity sort of to address, I guess, the affordability of downloading these costs to municipalities? We've heard from organizations like Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) that have talked about the potential for unintended consequences. You are, you know, forcing these communities, municipalities to make these funding decisions to keep policing levels where they are or to meet growth, but there are unanticipated consequences as a result. So does your ministry not undertake any risk assessment work to determine perhaps the negative impacts of these cost pressures to these communities?

Mr. Cooley: On the police funding model, we're certainly aware of municipalities' concerns regarding the cost pressures that they face. As we were developing the model, we looked at different configurations of how we can – what factors we could take into account when preparing the model. You know, the model adjusts for population, the model provides subsidies for crime severity and shadow populations, et cetera. And we will continue to monitor the model as we go forward. Having said that, what the police funding model does do is provide – all that money goes back into rural policing, so it is leading to increased services for those municipalities that now pay under the police funding model.

Ms. Renaud: Thank you for that. Would your ministry be able to table those factors that you talked about, that you listed, when making these decisions or designing this new policing funding strategy?

Answer:

The Police Funding Regulation came into force on April 1, 2020 and was created to implement two separate initiatives, both of which address police funding and resourcing matters. These are:

- The implementation of the Police Funding Model (PFM), and
- The absorption of Option 1 Enhanced Policing Positions (EPPs).

Providing adequate and effective policing services in the province of Alberta is the responsibility of the provincial government under the Police Act. The police funding model (PFM) takes the total cost of frontline officers and redistributes a portion of those costs to municipalities who receive the frontline policing from the Provincial Police Service (RCMP). When developing the police funding model, the ministry worked very closely with Municipal Affairs to develop and use a tool called “equalized assessment” to assess the relative financial capacity of municipalities. The ministry adopted this tool in the context of the police funding model that basically shows the municipality's ability to pay for services.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

The new PFM requires those communities that have not previously paid for frontline policing to begin contributing a portion of the costs. The model includes five variables that are used in calculations to distribute the province's costs, as follows:

- 50 per cent population
- 50 per cent equalized assessment
- Crime Severity Index (CSI): A community will be eligible for a subsidy if its average CSI over a three-year period is higher than the average for rural Alberta. CSI is a measurement used by Statistics Canada that places greater statistical weight on serious offences.
- Shadow population: This takes into account costs associated with providing services to populations that don't live in a community and therefore do not contribute to its property tax base.
- Distance from RCMP detachment: This recognizes that communities without a detachment experience longer response times and don't necessarily have the same relationship with detachment commanders.

Another main element considered was what proportion of the front-line policing costs would be charged back to rural municipalities, there was a wide range of options. In some jurisdictions in Canada they actually collect 100 per cent of those front-line policing costs. Alberta chose to start at collecting 10 per cent of the costs so that it's relatively affordable for rural municipalities and then scale up to 30 per cent in the fourth year based on a very serious consideration on affordability for those rural municipalities.

It is noted that front-line policing costs in this context does not include specialized units within the RCMP. It is only front-line policing costs that rural residents will be contributing towards. The specialized units that engage in major crimes, air services, dog services and forensic identification are excluded from those costs. All of those considerations were taken into account when developing the police funding model.

Each January, starting in 2021, municipalities will receive an invoice stating the amount that the municipality will pay for that fiscal year. Any modifiers to the amount have already been accounted for in the PFM formula.

Stakeholders offered valuable perspectives on the costs of policing in Alberta. Feedback from the engagement highlighted several areas of stakeholder concerns. Some are still concerned about having to pay for policing in their communities when before this cost was fully covered by the province. JSG staff have worked hard to address their concerns and have begun implementation of the model at a 10 per cent cost sharing level to allow time for municipalities to adjust to the new cost.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

3. Question (PA-419):

Ms Renaud: Just quickly, I have a question. I was looking at, you know, some of the discussion, obviously, from some of the stakeholders around the changes to the way policing is funded in Alberta, as described in the annual report, and one of the concerns is around resource deployment. Understanding that not all of the details are finalized, I suppose that municipalities and communities really want to know what they can expect in terms of additional provincially based specialized supports or funding. We've already asked for the number of FTEs, sort of boots on the ground by community, to be tabled, but I suppose – is it possible to get a more broad picture of what these rural communities that will be contributing where they didn't before, what else can they expect in terms of specialized policing supports such as whether it's auto theft, major crimes unit, crime reduction units, any of the things that augment local law enforcement? Is that possible, to get an estimate of what that increase of services will look like in those rural communities?

Mr. Sweeney: I'll try to answer the question, Chair. One of the considerations that we took into account when we were developing this model in terms of enhancing services in rural Alberta: we thought it was very important and the minister felt...

Answer:

As per the 2020/21 PPSA Call-Up of new positions, including 76 regular member and 57 public service employee positions, the Alberta RCMP has allotted positions in frontline policing, and specialized policing supports, including call back units, operational support unit, child advocacy centres, offender management, major crimes units, and crime reduction, while civilian positions have been created in areas, such as court case management, criminal operations, crime reduction and crime prevention. See question 1 for detailed FTE figures.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

4. Question (PA-422):

Mr. Schmidt: I'm wondering if the ADM could tell us what lessons he learned in fiscal '19-20 that will feed into the Police Act review. Could he be specific about what changes to the Police Act he would like to see as a result of '19-20 activities in the area of holding police forces to account? What specific changes would he recommend to the Police Act as a result of work that was done in this fiscal year?

Mr. Sweeney: I can't answer that question because we will be providing advice to the minister with respect to those issues, but I will say that there are many sectors of Alberta society, stakeholder groups, that have suggested that all matters that indicate that a police officer may have been involved in a criminal offence or a criminal matter ought to be mandatory reporting items, that there should be no discretion with respect to making any interpretation of what is a serious or sensitive matter.

Mr. Schmidt: Can the ADM tell us what the backlog of investigations was at the end of fiscal 2020?

Mr. Sweeney: I'd have to go to the annual report.

Mr. Schmidt: Can you commit to tabling that, then, ADM?

Answer:

To try and assess the backlog, the number of open files were determined first for the period of January 1, 2013 – March 31, 2019 and then January 1, 2013- March 31, 2021. The start point of 2013 was selected because that is when ASIRT first saw a marked increase in workload from previous years and became the catalyst for an unprecedented exponential increase in files.

Indeed, the average number of files between 2008-2013 was about 32.5 files per year. Looking at 2017-2020, the average number of files had increased to approx. 73 files per year.

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	March 31, 2021
Investigations	36	41	46	44	62	65	68	67	16
Reviews	5	11	31	37	7	3	2	5	3
Oversee and Review	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Assist other agency	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	6	0
Total	41	53	78	83	70	70	75	78	19

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

While 2017 had fewer files, it had the highest number of investigations ever. More concerning, the numbers of investigations have steadily increased yearly since then. In 2017, ASIRT shifted from a focus between investigations and reviews to doing more investigations. In a review, policing agencies would conduct an investigation, then send it to ASIRT. The goal of a review is to identify if the investigating agency has completed the investigation in a manner consistent with the level of investigative excellence that follows ASIRT's objective to maintain public confidence in policing. ASIRT did not examine the actual conduct that formed the subject of the investigation, it was rather a method to ensure investigations left with a home agency were done properly. ASIRT provided the results of a review and any recommendations to the investigating agency, however, there was no requirement that recommendations be followed or investigative steps completed, nor was the investigating agency required to share the results of the review. Ultimately, reviews took significant resources but did not provide the same value as an ASIRT investigation and it was decided the mandate of ASIRT would be better met actually doing the investigations and then reporting publicly on those investigations. The shift was a significant increase in the workload but if one of the goals is to enhance public confidence in policing — that would best be advanced by doing investigations rather than reviews. So while 2017 had fewer files, it had the most investigations which are significantly more resource intensive.

Open Files

As of March 31, 2019, ASIRT had approximately 104 open files, which constituted about 25% of its workload to date during that period. Two years later, as of March 31, 2021, ASIRT had approx. 188 open files, constituting over 33% of its workload. We cannot close files at the rate that they are coming in. Without change, the backlog will either stay the same or, more likely, worsen.

Hiring restraints and staffing issues from 2018 onward contributed to increased delays. COVID has also negatively impacted efficiencies. It is more difficult finding suitable interview settings that accommodate public health orders and public safety. Additionally, access to affected persons in hospital has been severely constrained (not unreasonably so in the circumstances but it is a difficulty). Practically speaking, however, the issue remains for proper resourcing so that the various pinch points are opened.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

5. Question (PA-424):

Mr. Schmidt: Who is responsible for enforcing public health measures with respect to COVID?

Mr. Sweeney: Public health inspectors that are appointed pursuant to the Public Health Act, police officers, and peace officers level 1.

Mr. Schmidt: Okay. Was there any consideration given to increasing the amount of money spent on public health measure enforcement in 2019/2020?

Answer:

The ministry of Justice and Solicitor General did not and does not provide any funding specifically for public health order enforcement. Alberta Health Services (AHS) provides direct funding to its own public health officers / inspectors for enforcing its Public Health Order's. However, the ministry does provide funding to municipalities to offset policing costs through annual Grants (MPAG and POG) as well as funding the provincial police service (the RCMP) that covers all aspects of policing operations, including the enforcement of Public Health Orders (PHO's) when required.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

6. Question (PA-426):

Mr. Schmidt: Did the ministry clearly communicate to police services in Alberta that it was their responsibility as well to enforce COVID-19 public health measures?

Mr. Sweeney: Yes. I worked with the chiefs of police on a regular basis at the start of the pandemic and during the course of the pandemic. Actually, later this week we're having further conversations with them with respect to public health order enforcement. We communicate protocols that differentiated who would be the lead agency with respect to different types of complaints. We have worked with authorized employers of peace officers and provided them with information, and we in turn received back enforcement-related reports from those entities.

Mr. Schmidt: Can the ADM table the communication that was done between the ministry by the end of fiscal 2020 and police forces as well as table the protocol for enforcement that he referenced?

Mr. Sweeney: Yes, we can provide that information. We worked with Alberta Health Services to develop the protocol, and it's a joint protocol. Yeah, we can provide.

Answer:

The ministry has been in regular communication, both through email and through virtual meetings with the Alberta Association of Chiefs of Police (AACP) throughout the pandemic around the Public Health Orders (PHO's), enforcement challenges, and any new developments. This included the Director of Law Enforcement/ADM Sweeney, Chiefs of Police, and at times the Chief Medical Officer of Health (CMOH), her staff and staff from Alberta Health Services and Alberta Health. This communication has been on-going, is extensive and continues in 2021.

Attached are two Protocols describing roles and responsibilities that were developed during 2020/21 (Attachments 2 and 3).

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

7. Question (PA-427):

Mr. Schmidt: I hope the ADM can table a detailed breakdown of under what circumstances AHS was designated the lead enforcement agency and under what circumstances police services were designated the lead enforcement agency. He's given a number of examples, but I think Albertans would be interested to know in excruciating detail what that breakdown was.

Answer:

Alberta Enforcement Agencies for Public Health Orders Roles and Responsibilities are as follows:

- Medical Officers of Health (MOH):
 - Utilize Section 39 under the Public Health Act to issue certificates for recalcitrant individuals to detain, test, and further detain individuals that are a risk to the public.

- AHS Public Health Inspectors:
 - Responds to business-related violations and complaints and work directly with owners to ensure compliance;
 - Follows-up with complaints that are not time-sensitive (e.g. businesses not following COVID-19 guidance);
 - Supports Police, CPO1 and CPO2 in passing along intelligence on violations or complaints (e.g., gatherings or parties);
 - Manages and oversee the public complaint portal; and
 - Can participate in scheduled coordination with inspection partners and police.

- Police Services:
 - Respond to complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements;
 - Enforce (i.e., ticket) individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions (masking is required in Edmonton and Calgary metropolitan areas in public places, including workplaces – e.g. malls and markets);
 - Provide ticketing assistance and protective services to AHS inspectors and to Community Peace Officer Level 1 and Community Peace Officer Level 2;
 - Apprehend and convey recalcitrant individuals to a named facility at request of MOH; and
 - Assist MOH in detaining, testing, and further detaining individuals who are a risk to the public.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

- Community Peace Officer Level 1:
 - Assist, or work independently of, Police in providing a rapid response to:
 - Enforcement (i.e. tickets) against individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements.
 - Complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements.
 - Issue tickets as required; and
 - Patrol and respond to concerns in malls, seasonal markets and other public spaces where crowding may occur.
- Community Peace Officer Level 2:
 - Provide an enforcement presence in malls and seasonal markets where crowding may occur to strengthen impression that distancing, gathering, and masking requirements are being carefully monitored;
 - Observe, interact with and educate public; not expected to write tickets; and
 - Act as a force-multiplier by informing police and CPO1 of areas where conflict is arising or tickets should be issued.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

8. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Hoffman: ... As mentioned on page 31 of the annual report, the indigenous court work program ensures that indigenous people receive fair, equitable, and culturally sensitive treatment in court by providing indigenous litigants, their families, and indigenous victims with services or assistance before, during, and after the court process. My question: what are the performance metrics put in place for this program to ensure that the program is delivering on its targets? My second question: were the program policies efficient in ensuring that the program was successful? Were there any new policies added to this program? My final question in regard to the indigenous court work program is: was there an increase in the need to deliver this program? If so, how did the department adjust to meet these increased needs?

Mr. Bosscha: Thank you for the question. The program's value for money is demonstrated by the cost of providing the elite level of services they provide to the clients and to support the courts and by the efficiencies created within the justice system. Support before, during, and after court costs the province about \$74 per client in criminal court while promoting the fair and . . .

Answer:

The ICW program plays an essential role in JSG's responsibility to improve overall access to justice through sharing information to resolve legal issues and providing legal representation to those in need. The ICW program aims to reduce costs to the justice system by reducing the number of appearances required to resolve matters, expediting resolution by providing the court with timely information about the accused and the availability of programs and services to meet individual needs.

The program's value for money is demonstrated by the cost of providing the level of services they provide to clients and to support the courts, and by the efficiencies created within the justice system. Support before, during and after court costs the province \$74 per client in criminal court while promoting the fair and culturally sensitive treatment of Indigenous people. Criminal court workers explain client's options, complete court forms, attend and speak in court on behalf of clients and assist with bail release plans. They also follow-up with clients after court to ensure they understand their release conditions. Criminal court workers create efficiencies in the justice system by reducing adjournments and AOJOs and increasing case flows.

Family court workers assist clients to obtain child and spousal support and assist with child protection matters. They too create efficiencies in the justice system by encouraging alternative dispute resolution processes, giving clients the option to resolve their matters outside of the courtroom.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

ICWP is the only program in the province that offers support to Indigenous people before, during and after the court process and is available to all Indigenous people, regardless of their circumstances and provides those services in court and in communities (including remote communities) across the province.

While other justice service providers do have some services they provide to Indigenous clients such as Legal Aid Alberta (LAA), John Howard, etc.; these organizations do not provide the same services as the ICWP and they lack an Indigenous specific focus and mandate, as well do not have a presence in the community like the ICWP.

The Alberta ICW program continues to improve services including the addition of bail court workers in the Edmonton and Calgary Remand Centers, expanding the Family Court Work services to triage Indigenous clients in First Nation communities and piloting remote filing of family law documents.

Program volumes between 2018/19 and 2019/20 have remained stable. The department works with Indigenous services providers to assess program needs and an expansion of the program is not anticipated at this time.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

9. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Pancholi: ... With respect to the Law Enforcement Review Board, would the minister be able to table information regarding caseload growth for the Law Enforcement Review Board going back two or three fiscal years prior to 2019/20, so beginning in 2017/18, if possible?

Answer:

In response to the member's question, the board is providing caseload information for the calendar years 2017 to 2020. The board tracks this information based on the calendar year rather than the fiscal year, as required under section 14 of the *Police Act*:

“after the end of each calendar year the board files with the Minister a report showing the number and nature of appeals and inquiries that it held, summaries of the findings made and any other material that the Minister directs.”

Board Activities	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number of matters filed ¹	42	46	46	32
Number of inquiries initiated ²	1	2		
Number of preliminary applications conducted ³	16	15	12	13
Number of matters concluded ⁴	41	42	40	25

The following supplemental information will have a financial impact on the board in 2021:

- The caseload numbers for 2020 were lower than previous years, in large part as a result of the restrictions in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The board conducted in-person hearings until February 2020. Thereafter, hearings were conducted in-writing, with the board transitioning to WebEx hearings in the fall of 2020.

As a result, the board did not spend the funds allocated to travel in 2020, as in-person hearings were not conducted and members did not incur travel expenses. The board anticipates utilizing the full amount allocated to travel in 2021, once in-person hearings resume and board members incur travel expenses.

¹ Includes notices of appeals, request for reviews.

² Section 17 of the *Police Act* states that the board may, on its own motion, conduct inquiries respecting complaints, or at the request of the Minister, conduct inquiries in respect of any matter respecting policing or police services.

³ Preliminary matters need to be addressed and resolved before the final hearing and conclusion of the appeal.

⁴ A matter is concluded when the board issues a final decision in an appeal, review or inquiry.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

10. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Pancholi: ... With respect to the annual report reference on page 26 and page 30 with respect to hiring 50 new Crown prosecutors, the ministry was allocated \$10 million in 2019-2020 to hire new Crown prosecutors, but at the end of that fiscal year it appears that the number of Crown prosecutors remains the same at least in terms of position. What was the \$10 million used in 2019-2020 for with respect to hiring new Crown prosecutors? What barriers are you facing to staffing up, and what new initiatives did you undertake in that fiscal year?

Answer:

- There were no expenditures in preparation to hiring the 50 new Crown prosecutors in the 2019-20 Fiscal year. Funding for the platform commitment was received in the 2020-21 Fiscal year.
- Work continues to fill existing Crown prosecutor vacancies; we have ongoing job competitions and we have increased the size of our articling program.
- Hiring more prosecutors is essential to addressing increasing caseloads and ensuring that viable criminal cases can proceed.
- Work continues to address concerns that have led to issues with recruitment and retention of prosecutors including allocating new positions to help ensure manageable caseloads.
- Our government also increased the number of articling students in Justice and Solicitor General to help recruit lawyers to ultimately work as prosecutors – that number increases from 16 to 20 in 2021.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

11. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Pancholi: ... With respect to legal aid funding, page 37 and 38 of the annual report, the ministry officials have indicated that \$34.4 million has been at least provided, funded by the Alberta Law Foundation. I just want to clarify whether or not that funding is actually committed above and beyond the 25 per cent that's part of the trust accounts that the law foundation pays. What was the planning in terms of 2018-19, the three-year fiscal outlook, in terms of funding for legal aid? Does the \$34.4 million make legal aid funding whole for 2019- 20 going forward? What were the planned projections for legal aid funding, and what will the new funding arrangement mean?

Answer:

The \$34.4 million that the Alberta Law Foundation (ALF) committed is in addition to the 25 per cent of interest on lawyers trust accounts contribution required under the Legal Profession Act.

Each year Legal Aid Alberta submits a detailed budget and business plan to the department. The department thoroughly reviews the submission and follows standard processes for making budget decisions.

The \$34.4 million provided by ALF over 3 years satisfies the budget requirements from 2019/20 to 2021/22. This funding arrangement means that LAA will be able to maintain the current scope of services for the program.

**JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL
OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

12. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Pancholi: ... with respect to comments that my colleague the Member for St. Albert, Marie Renaud, made earlier about the police funding model, I just want to clarify. Can the ministry please table estimates for all municipalities, not just Edmonton and Calgary that saw a reduction in fine revenue as a result of changes to fine revenue collection?

Answer:

Please see responses in the attachments (Attachment 4 – Provincial Fine Retention (PFR) Model Based on 2018-19 Payments)

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

13. Question (PA-428):

Ms. Pancholi: ...On the issue of food in prisons, there was a recent issue about kosher food being provided in prisons. I'm wondering if the ministry can table what policy was in place in 2019-2020 around cultural and religious meals being served. How did this compare to other jurisdictions, and what are the spending for meals versus kosher meals versus vegan meals? I understand a policy was in place. That's what the ministry, at least the minister's representative, had indicated. Tabling that policy would be appreciated very much.

Answer:

1) What policy was in place in 2019/20 around cultural and religious meals being served?

Requests for special diets in Young Offender facilities shall be dealt with in accordance with this policy:

1. Requests for special diets shall be granted for health, religious or lifestyle choice reasons subject to the practical problems encountered by the Centre in supplying the necessary diet items. Young persons may not change their diet selection once they have made the initial declaration, unless the change is determined by the Centre's physician, for medical needs, or the Centre chaplain for religious beliefs.

2. The food services contractor shall have a nutritionist determine an adequate special diet consistent with available Centre stock

Requests for special diets in Adult facilities shall be dealt with in accordance with this policy:

Adult inmates accommodated in correctional facilities under the supervision of the Correctional Services Division's Adult Centre Operations Branch (ACOB) are provided cultural and religious meals pursuant to ACOB Policies and Procedures 8-16.4, Regulation of Religious Activity, Standards:

Religious Diet

9. Providing an inmate is of a bona-fide faith confirmed by the centre chaplain, they may abstain from eating those food items served to the general population that are prohibited by their religion.

10. The inmate may receive added portions of non-rationed food items that do not violate the restrictions of the faith professed by the person.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

2) How did this compare to other jurisdictions?

- BC Corrections purchases frozen kosher certified dinners from third party vendors costing \$14.50 per meal, or \$43.50 per diem.
- Over the years, Saskatchewan Corrections has received very few kosher religious diet requests. In these instances, the kitchen manager purchased kosher certified meat to replace the regular inmate meal meat entrée, or the inmate was offered a vegetarian meal option.
- Manitoba Corrections purchases frozen kosher certified meals from Toronto Kosher costing approximately \$7.00 per meal. The local source cost is approximately \$15.00 per meal. The frozen meals are heated in kitchen microwaves and are delivered to inmate living units with the regular meals. Manitoba's cost per regular inmate meal is \$3.74 per meal.
- Ontario Corrections operates a centralized "cook- chill" warehouse where kosher certified meals are prepared, frozen and delivered to nine Ontario correctional facilities; excluding condiments, beverages, breads, and desserts
- Nova Scotia Corrections has never received an inmate request for kosher certified meals. If a request was received, the inmate would be offered a vegan and vegetarian meal, which does not conflict with the inmate's religious faith.
- Prince Edward Island Corrections has never received an inmate request for kosher certified meals and the provision of religious meals is determined on a case by case basis.
- The CSC does not operate kosher certified kitchens and are unable to produce kosher certified meals due to rigorous kosher certification requirements. The CSC procures frozen kosher certified meals through Regional Individual Standing Offers established via Public Services and Procurement Canada.
- The remaining Canadian correctional jurisdictions were unable to respond by the due date.

3) What are the spending for meals versus kosher meals versus vegan meals?

Response: Pursuant to the current Food Services Contract expiring September 30, 2021, the average Fixed Price per Meal Cost (including regular, vegetarian and vegan diets) is \$3.61.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

14. (PA-429):

Ms. Armstrong-Homeniuk: ... With the program currently funding 15 programs located on eight Métis settlements and seven First Nation communities in Alberta, how did the ministry apply the policies and regulations of this program to meet the desired outcomes of this funding while allowing this program to meet the varied and individual needs for these communities? Where were the performance measures for this program? Also, how did the ministry ensure that these funded programs incorporated community perspectives and capacity into mainstream justice processes?

Answer:

The Indigenous Justice Program (IJP) is fully funded by the federal government. This community-based program is designed to divert Indigenous people from the mainstream justice system. There is a zero net cost to Alberta. Alberta's contribution to the program is "in-kind funding" through joint administration. Alberta's in-kind contribution is Corrections' funding for the Community Correctional Societies of the Blood Tribe, Yellowhead Tribal Council, Tsuutina and Stoney First Nations. Services provided by the Indigenous communities vary and individual programs are designed to incorporate community perspectives and capacity into mainstream justice processes.

The Indigenous Justice Program aims to:

- assist Indigenous people to assume greater responsibility for the administration of justice in their communities;
- reflect and include Indigenous values within the justice system; and
- contribute to a decrease in the rate of victimization, crime and incarceration among Indigenous people in communities with community based justice programs that are funded by the program

The objectives of the IJP are to assist Indigenous people in assuming greater responsibility for the administration of justice in their communities, reflect and include Indigenous values within the justice system, and decrease victimization, crime and incarceration among Indigenous people using community-based justice programs (funded by the IJP). Community-based justice programs include diversion, pre-sentencing options, sentencing alternatives, family and civil mediation; victims support service, and offender reintegration services.

The IJP allows the justice system to be more responsive to the needs of the Indigenous people by supporting community-based justice programs that provide an alternative to incarceration.

Program evaluations have consistently identified high rates of satisfaction expressed by clients and reported low rates of recidivism. In addition, IJP was found to have succeeded

**JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL
OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

in supporting the establishment of community based justice programs in many Indigenous communities and that these programs offer a range of types of alternative programming that are recognized as being culturally relevant to the people in those communities.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

15. Question (PA-429):

Ms. Armstrong-Homeniuk: ... My next questions are regarding drug treatment courts. Pages 18 and 24 of the annual report touched on the work of the drug treatment courts, DTCs, and how they combat cycles of crime and addiction. Page 24 states that there will be an additional \$20 million committed to expanding the use of DTCs over the next four years. What is the basis of the decision by the ministry to expand DTCs? On page 24 of the annual report it mentions that the ministry is developing consistent provincial standards to inform a future DTC indicator. I was wondering if the department could provide an update on the development of these indicators.

Answer:

Part 1:

- DTCs have a long standing history of success in Canada and internationally. DTCs have been shown to effectively combat drug-driven crime, by focusing on their participants' underlying causes of addiction and criminal behavior.
- DTCs in Alberta have been in existence since 2005 and have had demonstrable success in reducing crime in Calgary and Edmonton. These programs have consistently shown that DTC interventions on high-risk criminally addicted offenders can significantly reduce their likelihood of reoffending.
- Both the Calgary and Edmonton DTCs report that 70% of their graduates have no substantive convictions following their involvement in the DTC. Beyond this, these DTCs have displayed the ability to reduce the level of addiction of their participants and decrease the severity of their anti-social behaviors.
- The expansion of DTCs was a platform commitment of the current government that was based on the reported need from communities for an effective intervention to combat the rise of drug-driven crime.
- Many of these communities have the necessary resources required for a DTC, however, required larger scale support and coordination to establish DTCs in their areas and ongoing oversight of their programs to ensure sustainability.
- Seeing that DTCs are effective at reducing drug-driven crime across communities and that many Alberta communities have the resources necessary to support a DTC, JSG established a coordinated initiative to expand DTCs to new communities in the province and develop a provincial program to oversee their operation.

Part 2:

- JSG has created a provincial DTC Program Framework that details consistent provincial standards that Alberta DTC must comply with. These provincial standards build upon the existing nationally recognized DTC principles established by the Canadian Association of Drug Treatment Court Professionals (CADTCP). These national principals and provincial standards both act to ensure Alberta DTCs maintain fidelity to the internationally recognized DTC model.

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

- This provincial DTC Program Framework is the starting point for the development of a broader governance structure for all DTC programs in the province.
- As part of this Framework, Alberta DTCs are required to participate in a provincial evaluation that will examine the outcomes of these courts and their ability to comply with the aforementioned principles and standards. It is this evaluation that will drive future indicators for the provincial DTCs.
- There are a number of research questions that are being pursued as part of this evaluation; however, the ones that will likely be used for future indicators are:

Outcome Evaluation Questions:

- 1) To what extent, has the DTC impacted relapse and drug addiction?
- This question will examine the affect that DTCs have on an individual's level of addiction or "Addiction Risk."
- 2) To what extent, has the DTC impacted pro-social lifestyle indicators?
- This question will examine the affect that DTCs have on an individual's level of anti-social risk.
- 3) To what extent has the DTC impacted recidivism?
- This question will examine the affect that DTCs have on an individual's future criminal offending.

Governance Evaluation Questions:

1. To what extent is the DTC adhering to provincial standards?
- This question will examine how well Alberta DTCs adhere to the provincial DTC Framework.

These research questions will require time to accurately assess, and will establish the indicators for the success of DTCs once JSG has completed the expansion phase of this initiative.



Alberta Enforcement Agencies for Public Health Orders Roles and Responsibilities

Agency	Roles and Responsibilities During Current Restrictions	Empowerments and Limitations
Alberta Health / Office of the Chief Medical Office of Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops COVID-19 policy and guidance. • Provides expert consult to operationalize CMOH orders and guidance. • Issues CMOH Orders to protect Albertans from the COVID-19 pandemic. • Liaises with partners with an enforcement role including Alberta Health Services (AHS); Justice and Solicitor General (JSG) (and through JSG, police, CPO1, CPO2); Alberta Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis (AGLC); and Alberta Labour. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not conduct inspections or investigations. • Cannot undertake enforcement of any kind.
AHS Safe Healthy Environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to business-related violations and complaints and work directly with owners to ensure compliance. • Follows-up with complaints that are not time-sensitive (e.g. businesses not following COVID-19 guidance). • Supports Police, CPO1 and CPO2 in passing along intelligence on violations or complaints (e.g., gatherings or parties). • Manages and oversee the public complaint portal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can enter any public place without warrant and can request to be accompanied by a police officer or expert. • Can close facilities and prevent public access to any location. • Can order any work to be completed although orders can be appealed. • Can pursue prosecution under the <i>Public Health Act</i> (however a very limited number of prosecutions are pursued). • Can investigate infractions that have occurred in

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can participate in scheduled coordination with inspection partners and police. 	<p>the past to prevent recurrence and can pursue enforcement on actions occurring within the past 6 months with sufficient evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot write tickets. • Cannot provide a timely response to illegal gatherings, but may be able to support enforcement if advance notice is provided.
AGLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for enforcing restricted hours related to liquor service and consumption at businesses. • Monitors the closure of table play at casinos. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can perform “operating checks” in any licensed facility. • Can achieve compliance through education or administrative sanction as determined by AGLC regulatory division. • Cannot issue tickets.
AJSG Public Security Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for ensuring adequate and effective policing in the Province. • Responsible for oversight of all Law Enforcement Agencies. • Responsible for the provision of authorities to peace officers. • Provides advice and direction to policing and law enforcement agencies in general, on behalf of and within the mandate of the Minister. • Sheriff’s Branch, Fish and Wildlife Enforcement and Commercial Vehicle Enforcement are housed within the Public Security Division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheriff’s Branch, Fish and Wildlife Enforcement and Commercial Vehicle Enforcement are authorized to enforce the <i>Public Health Act</i>.
Justice/ Crown Prosecutor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represents AHS and Police in prosecuting an individual or corporation for violations cited under the <i>Public Health Act</i>. • Provides an advisory role to AHS and Police for charges or tickets that are being contemplated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determines whether prosecution of an individual or entity/business is in the public interest. • Not available to advise enforcement officials on enforcement during weekends and evenings.

<p>Police Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. • Enforce (i.e., ticket) individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions (masking is required in Edmonton and Calgary metropolitan areas in public places, including workplaces – e.g. malls and markets). • Provide ticketing assistance and protective services to AHS inspectors and to CPO1 and CPO2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can conduct investigations. • Can issue tickets. • Limited power of entry into public or private places without a judicial order, which may impede enforcement of private social gatherings. • Must triage CMOH Order violations against reports of other infractions. • RCMP are often the only level of enforcement in certain communities.
<p>Community Peace Officers (Level 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist, or work independently of, Police in providing a rapid response to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enforcement (i.e. tickets) against individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. ○ Complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. • Issue tickets as required. • Patrol and respond to concerns in malls, seasonal markets and other public spaces where crowding may occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can issue tickets. • Trained to conduct enforcement independently of Police. • Limited power of entry into public or private places, which may impede enforcement of private social gatherings. • Not all communities have CPO1 support.

<p>Community Peace Officers (Level 2) / Bylaw</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an enforcement presence in malls and seasonal markets where crowding may occur to strengthen impression that distancing, gathering, and masking requirements are being carefully monitored. • Observe, interact with and educate public; not expected to write tickets. • Act as a force-multiplier by informing police and CPO1 of areas where conflict is arising or tickets should be issued. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By exception on request, some officers may be authorized to issue tickets. • Generally not trained to the same level as CPO 1s and may not be trained to safely conduct enforcement independently of CPO1 or Police. • Limited power of entry into public or private places, which may impede enforcement of private social gatherings. • Not all communities have CPO2 support.
<p>Labour</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners with AHS in some workplace inspections. • Enhances inspections of workplaces across the province to address areas of concern that have been noted in the transmission of COVID-19 or where there are reports that workers/employers are not implementing the CMOH orders correctly. This includes for example, workplaces considering “cohorting” to be a satisfactory mitigation for preventing workplace infection. • Enforcement (i.e., ticketing) of mandatory masking in workplaces in the Edmonton and Calgary regions in support of CMOH Order 38-2020. *Note that this requires 2 MO changes using the PHE to allow for this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have power of entry into worksites under provincial jurisdiction (we do not have authority in federally regulated workplaces). • Can issue orders, administrative penalties and tickets to take action against workplaces not in compliance. • Will be able to issue tickets to workers and employers for violations of mandatory masking provisions in EDM and CGY. *Note that this requires EMCC approval and MO changes for Labour and JSG. A process has begun to enable this. • Not mandated to protect the public; rather focus on worker safety and employer obligation to protect workers.

For future discussion:

- Should we pursue targeted enforcement measures for hotspots in the province?
- Is there appetite to pursue retrospective investigations of infractions based on complaints or outbreak data? Is this possible?
- How do we develop better collaboration between Police and AHS?

- Police are having difficulty obtaining information from AHS to verify that an individual in question ought to be quarantined/isolated.
- The issue is less so with travel-related quarantine, and more to do with requirements to isolate after a positive test.
- What exactly can be prosecuted and what should be ticketable from the JSG perspective (i.e. in the public interest)?



**Alberta Enforcement Agencies for Public Health Orders
Roles and Responsibilities**

Agency	Roles and Responsibilities During Current Restrictions	Empowerments and Limitations	Suggested Revisions to Roles and Responsibilities
Alberta Health / Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops COVID-19 policy and guidance. • Provides expert consult to operationalize CMOH orders and guidance. • Issues CMOH Orders to protect Albertans from the COVID-19 pandemic. • Liaises with partners with an enforcement role including Alberta Health Services (AHS); Justice and Solicitor General (JSG) (and through JSG, police, CPO1, CPO2); Alberta Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis (AGLC); and Alberta Labour. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not conduct inspections or investigations. • Cannot undertake enforcement of any kind. 	
AHS Safe Healthy Environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to business-related violations and complaints and work directly with owners to ensure compliance. • Follows-up with complaints that are not time-sensitive (e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can enter any public place without warrant and can request to be accompanied by a police officer or expert. • Can close facilities and prevent public access to any 	

	<p>businesses not following COVID-19 guidance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Police, CPO1 and CPO2 in passing along intelligence on violations or complaints (e.g., gatherings or parties). • Manages and oversee the public complaint portal. • Can participate in scheduled coordination with inspection partners and police. 	<p>location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can pursue civil litigation through Court of Queen’s Bench Orders (limited number can be pursued because of Court Capacity) • Can order any work to be completed although orders can be appealed. • Can pursue prosecution under the <i>Public Health Act</i> (however a very limited number of prosecutions are pursued). • Can investigate infractions that have occurred in the past to prevent recurrence and can pursue enforcement on actions occurring within the past 6 months with sufficient evidence. • Cannot write tickets. • Cannot provide a timely response to illegal gatherings, but may be able to support enforcement if advance notice is provided. 	
<p>AHS Medical Officers of Health (MOH)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize Section 39 under the <i>Public Health Act</i> to issue certificates for recalcitrant individuals to detain, test, and further detain individuals that are a risk to the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A distinct MOH group represents each AHS zone. • MOH groups maintain an on-call schedule. • Further detention beyond section 39.2 certificate is 	

		achieved by use of section 44 Isolation Order, issued by local attending physician(s).	
AGLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for enforcing restricted hours related to liquor service and consumption at businesses. Monitors the closure of table play at casinos. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can perform “operating checks” in any licensed facility. Can achieve compliance through education or administrative sanction as determined by AGLC regulatory division. Cannot issue tickets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AGLC inspectors may participate in inspections conducted by AHS and by law enforcement
AJSG Public Security Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for ensuring adequate and effective policing in the Province. Responsible for oversight of all Law Enforcement Agencies. Responsible for the provision of authorities to peace officers. Provides advice and direction to policing and law enforcement agencies in general, on behalf of and within the mandate of the Minister. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot undertake enforcement of any kind. Cannot undertake inspections of the public of any kind. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sheriff’s Branch, Fish and Wildlife Enforcement and Commercial Vehicle Enforcement are authorized to enforce the <i>Public Health Act</i>.
Justice/ Crown Prosecutor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Alberta Crown Prosecution is responsible for prosecuting Violations of the CMOH Order and the <i>Public Health Act</i> violations in the Provincial Court of Alberta. Provides an advisory role to AHS and Police for charges or tickets that are being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determines whether prosecution of an individual or entity/business is in the public interest. 	

	<p>contemplated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ACPS is available for calls after hours and on weekends. Peter Mackenzie 403-470-0875. 		
Police Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. Enforce (i.e., ticket) individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions (masking is required in Edmonton and Calgary metropolitan areas in public places, including workplaces – e.g. malls and markets). Provide ticketing assistance and protective services to AHS inspectors and to CPO1 and CPO2. Apprehend and convey recalcitrant individuals to a named facility at request of MOH. Assist MOH in detaining, testing, and further detaining individuals who are a risk to the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can conduct investigations. Can issue tickets. Limited power of entry into public or private places without a judicial order, which may impede enforcement of private social gatherings. Must triage CMOH Order violations against reports of other infractions. RCMP are often the only level of enforcement in certain communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipalities and individual officers may choose to “opt out” of enforcement of CMOH Orders.
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist, or work independently of, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can issue tickets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipalities and

<p>Peace Officers (Level 1)</p>	<p>Police in providing a rapid response to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enforcement (i.e. tickets) against individuals who are violating gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. ○ Complaints of a time-sensitive nature relating to individuals or groups of individuals who are contravening CMOH Orders, with a focus on gathering, distancing and masking restrictions/requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issue tickets as required. ● Patrol and respond to concerns in malls, seasonal markets and other public spaces where crowding may occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trained to conduct enforcement independently of Police. ● Limited power of entry into public or private places, which may impede enforcement of private social gatherings. ● Not all communities have CPO1 support. 	<p>individual officers may choose to “opt out” of enforcement of CMOH Orders.</p>
<p>Community Peace Officers (Level 2) / Bylaw</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide an enforcement presence in malls and seasonal markets where crowding may occur to strengthen impression that distancing, gathering, and masking requirements are being carefully monitored. ● Observe, interact with and educate public; not expected to write tickets. ● Act as a force-multiplier by informing police and CPO1 of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By exception on request, some officers may be authorized to issue tickets. ● Generally not trained to the same level as CPO 1s and may not be trained to safely conduct enforcement independently of CPO1 or Police. ● Limited power of entry into public or private places, which may impede 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Municipalities and individual officers may choose to “opt out” of enforcement of CMOH Orders.

	<p>areas where conflict is arising or tickets should be issued.</p>	<p>enforcement of private social gatherings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all communities have CPO2 support. 	
<p>Labour</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners with AHS in some workplace inspections. • Enhances inspections of workplaces across the province to address areas of concern that have been noted in the transmission of COVID-19 or where there are reports that workers/employers are not implementing the CMOH orders correctly. • Enforce (i.e., ticketing) mandatory masking in workplaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have power of entry into worksites under provincial jurisdiction (we do not have authority in federally regulated workplaces). • Can issue orders, administrative penalties and tickets to take action against workplaces not in compliance. • Will be able to issue tickets to workers and employers for violations of mandatory masking provisions. • Not mandated to protect the public; rather focus on worker safety and employer obligation to protect workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour OHS APO 2s have the authority to enforce the CMOH's Orders within businesses.

Provincial Fine Retention (PFR) Model based on 2018-19 Payments

MUNICIPALITY	Estimated Change due to Increase in PFR based on 2018-2019 Payments Note 3	Actual Payments to Municipalities for 2018-2019 Note 2	Actual Payments to Municipalities for 2019-2020 Note 2	Variance for Payments made between 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 Note 1
AIRDRIE	(305,249)	1,726,913	1,730,879	3,966
BROOKS	(61,829)	342,908	338,845	(4,063)
CALGARY	(10,517,591)	68,767,117	67,745,880	(1,021,237)
CAMROSE	(144,528)	821,268	661,744	(159,524)
CHESTERMERE	(130,745)	744,403	922,081	177,678
COLD LAKE	(54,492)	301,338	98,044	(203,294)
EDMONTON	(11,142,807)	67,116,223	73,629,789	6,513,566
FORT SASKATCHEWAN	(319,693)	1,795,905	2,167,813	371,908
GRANDE PRAIRIE	(1,027,905)	5,844,152	5,849,236	5,083
LACOMBE	(45,779)	260,427	253,494	(6,933)
LEDUC	(166,004)	911,191	1,045,256	134,065
LETHBRIDGE	(893,437)	5,328,430	5,276,027	(52,403)
LLOYDMINSTER	(120,356)	600,674	759,653	158,978
MEDICINE HAT	(492,943)	2,828,246	2,952,398	124,152
RED DEER	(720,289)	4,569,150	3,983,013	(586,137)
SPRUCE GROVE	(697,368)	3,868,924	3,262,149	(606,775)
ST. ALBERT	(671,613)	3,760,703	3,507,799	(252,904)
WETASKIWIN	(53,764)	300,241	183,391	(116,850)
STRATHCONA COUNTY	(893,040)	5,022,648	5,459,946	437,298
WOOD BUFFALO, Regional Municipality of	(445,293)	3,248,258	2,681,583	(566,675)
BONNYVILLE NO. 87, M.D. OF	(35,788)	195,831	152,464	(43,368)
CAMROSE COUNTY	(17,939)	105,984	104,844	(1,140)
CLEARWATER COUNTY	(53,617)	295,203	305,800	10,598
FOOTHILLS NO. 31, M.D. OF	(47,546)	263,985	391,024	127,039
GRANDE PRAIRIE NO. 1, COUNTY OF	(70,317)	396,239	406,514	10,274
LEDUC COUNTY	(46,186)	269,475	205,585	(63,890)
LETHBRIDGE COUNTY	(25,920)	146,127	155,677	9,549
MOUNTAIN VIEW COUNTY	(27,162)	151,097	166,216	15,119
PARKLAND COUNTY	(96,495)	540,419	497,984	(42,435)
RED DEER COUNTY	(62,565)	346,919	404,415	57,497
ROCKY VIEW COUNTY	(195,464)	1,094,684	1,149,116	54,432
STURGEON COUNTY	(40,920)	231,679	289,905	58,226
WETASKIWIN NO. 10, COUNTY OF	(34,342)	187,408	178,306	(9,103)
BANFF	(51,815)	387,500	519,562	132,062
BEAUMONT	(190,099)	1,044,516	853,660	(190,856)
BLACK DIAMOND	(20,735)	114,088	96,535	(17,553)
BLACKFALDS	(18,150)	102,991	102,319	(672)
CANMORE	(180,440)	1,027,885	1,002,043	(25,842)
COALDALE	(94,209)	519,676	579,174	59,498
COCHRANE	(71,275)	394,004	512,739	118,735
DEVON	(166,446)	912,480	623,237	(289,243)
DRAYTON VALLEY	(19,297)	105,708	68,236	(37,472)
DRUMHELLER	(28,324)	154,357	134,771	(19,586)
EDSON	(301,447)	1,655,144	661,748	(993,395)
HIGH RIVER	(24,591)	134,150	113,372	(20,778)
HINTON	(116,239)	610,061	517,724	(92,337)
INNISFAIL	(19,715)	110,240	110,349	109
MORINVILLE	(53,796)	307,404	415,380	107,977
OKOTOKS	(76,802)	413,345	434,024	20,679
OLDS	(17,287)	103,211	106,294	3,083
PEACE RIVER	(21,996)	122,265	110,047	(12,217)
PENHOLD	(15,175)	100,687	67,945	(32,741)
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOUSE	(23,235)	137,769	132,895	(4,873)
SLAVE LAKE	(66,459)	365,649	398,727	33,079
STONY PLAIN	(104,697)	582,965	384,740	(198,225)
STRATHMORE	(23,809)	153,320	165,853	12,533
SYLVAN LAKE	(42,489)	281,012	281,151	140
TABER	(93,068)	522,834	498,454	(24,380)
VEGREVILLE	(26,142)	142,135	76,869	(65,266)
WAINWRIGHT	(85,785)	472,352	344,769	(127,584)
WHITECOURT	(207,282)	1,128,849	762,300	(366,549)
Subtotal for 61 Municipalities who received over \$100,000	(31,819,792)	194,490,766	196,991,786	2,501,020

Notes:

- 1 Change in payments to municipalities is due to variances in tickets issued, and payments made not the change in PFR as this was not implemented until April 2020 and fiscal year end has yet to be completed.
- 2 The amounts paid to municipalities include municipal fines and other provincial acts in addition to *Traffic Safety Act* payments
- 3 The Provincial Fine Retention (PFR) Rate change to 40% did not come into effect until April 01, 2020 and therefore actual impact won't be available until the close of fiscal year 2020-21 financial books.